

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16, 18-22, 24, and 26-29 were presented for examination. Claims 1-16, 18-22, 24 and 26-28 were rejected in the final Office Action of July 25, 2008.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 16 and 26 are hereby amended merely to more specifically recite inherent aspects as originally claimed. Claims 13-15 and 24 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 30 and 31 are hereby added.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections

### **Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,170,955 to Campbell et al. ("Campbell") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,300 to Kendrick ("Kendrick") and U.S. Patent No. 6,705,774 to Tashiro et al. ("Tashiro"); on page 11 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected over Campbell, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141657 ("Novak"); on page 12 of the Office Action, claims 10, 12 and 13 were rejected over Campbell, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,768,868 to Schnell ("Schnell"); on page 13 of the Office Action, claim 15 was rejected over Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 5,208,624 to MacKay ("MacKay"); on page 14 of the Office Action, claim 19 was rejected over Campbell, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,784,924 to Ward ("Ward"); on page 16 of the Office Action, claim 21 was rejected over Campbell in view of Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0112335 ("Strandwitz"); on page 17 of the Office Action, claims 27 and 28 were

rejected over Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,812,970 to McBride (“McBride”); and on page 18 of the Office Action, claim 29 was rejected over Campbell, Kendrick, Tashiro and U.S. Patent No. 6,137,958 to Toyoda (“Toyoda”). Rejections of claims 1-12, 16, 18-22, 24 and 26-28 are respectfully traversed in view of the amendment to the claims. Claims 13-15 and 24 are cancelled herein; and thus, the rejections of these claims are now obviated.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, the following:

a glare shield;  
a low profile camera housing comprising a shell, an end of the shell circumscribing an opening for receiving the glare shield, the end of the shell in a substantially circular shape and adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with an external transparent medium, the glare shield substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening;  
an adjustable video sensor assembly within the low profile housing, wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the glare shield and transmits the received images through a network interface;  
***a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor;*** and  
a first mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for flush mounting the end of the shell circumscribing the opening in direct contact with the external transparent medium. (Emphasis added)

The network video camera of claim 1 includes a glare shield, a low profile camera housing, an adjustable video sensor assembly, a positioning knob and a first mounting assembly. The low profile camera housing comprises a shell having an end that is substantially circular in shape. The glare shield is substantially in level with the end of the shell. The adjustable video sensor assembly is placed within the low profile camera housing and receives images through the glare shield. A positioning knob is connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting the viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor. A first mounting assembly is attached to the low profile camera housing to flush mount the end of the shell in direct contact with an external transparent medium.

The feature of “*a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor*” is advantageous, among other reasons, because a user can conveniently adjust the viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor by positioning the knob without dismounting and remounting the network video camera. This feature is also advantageous because mechanical or electronic devices for adjusting the viewing angle can be omitted, thereby simplifying the construction of the network video camera.

None of the cited references disclose the feature of “*a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Campbell discloses an optical assembly that is removably mounted on the windshield of a vehicle. See Campbell, col. 2, line 66 – col. 3, line 2. The optical assembly includes a mounting bracket 1 that is attached to the windshield of a vehicle by an adhesive 41. See Campbell, col. 3, ll. 33-37; and col. 3, ll. 46-47. An optical device 2 may be inserted into the mounting bracket 1. Therefore, the optical device 2 has a lens element 45 that is located within or behind an opening 35. See Campbell, col. 4, ll. 52-53. The lens element 45 in Campbell, however, is fixed and there is no mechanism to adjust the viewing angle of the optical device 2. The optical device 2 of Campbell must be dismounted and remounted to adjust the viewing angle of the optical device 2. Nowhere in Campbell does it disclose any mechanism for adjusting the viewing angle after the optical device 2 is secured to the mounting bracket 1. Therefore, Campbell fails to disclose the feature of “*a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor*” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Kendrick also fails to disclose the feature of “*a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor.*” Kendrick relates to a blind spot viewing system for viewing the blind spot of a vehicle. See, for example, Abstract of Kendrick. In Kendrick, the viewing angle of a video sensor is mechanically adjusted using a pair of servos 13, 14. See Kendrick, col. 4, ll. 59-64. The servos 13, 14 are controlled remotely by electronic signals received from a controller placed on the dash or on a driver’s door. See Kendrick, col. 5, ll. 9-15. Nowhere in Kendrick does it disclose any positioning knob for manually adjusting the video sensor assembly. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Kendrick.

Tashiro also fails to disclose this feature. Tashiro was cited in the Office Action merely for disclosing a network video camera transmitting images through a network interface. Tashiro discloses a camera apparatus 1 placed on a flat surface that can be tilted or panned mechanically using motors. See Tashiro, col. 6, ll. 2-11; and col 6, ll. 19-28. Nowhere in Tashiro does it disclose any method of manually tilting or panning the camera. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Tashiro.

Novak also fails to disclose this feature. Novak was cited in the Office Action for teaching a system for controlling a web-cam transmission. Nowhere in Novak does it disclose any mechanism for adjusting a viewing angle of the webcam. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Novak.

Schnell also fails to disclose this feature. Schnell was cited in the Office Action merely for teaching a waterproof housing for a camera. In Schnell, a lens 904 and a camera mechanism 913 are fixed to the body of the camera and are not movable relative to the body. See Schnell, FIG. 10. In Schnell, the viewing angle of the camera is changed by moving the

housing enclosing the camera. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Schnell.

MacKay also fails to disclose this feature. MacKay was cited in the Office Action merely for disclosing the use of a polarized filter on the front of the camera. Nowhere in MacKay does it disclose any mechanism for changing the viewing angle of the camera. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from MacKay.

Ward also fails to disclose this feature. Ward was cited in the Office Action merely for transmitting a captured image data through a network. Ward does not disclose any mechanism for changing the viewing angle of the camera. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Ward.

Strandwitz also fails to disclose this feature. Strandwitz was cited in the Office Action for disclosing a wireless camera that transmits images through a network. Strandwitz does not disclose any mechanism for changing the viewing angle of the camera. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Strandwitz.

McBride also fails to disclose this feature. McBride was cited in the Office Action for disclosing a surveillance system where the camera communicates through a power line to a monitor or to a network. McBride does not disclose any mechanism for changing the viewing angle of the camera. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from McBride.

Toyoda also fails to disclose this feature. Toyoda discloses a camera with an optical filter for a photographic lens. See Toyoda, col. 1, ll. 6-7. Toyoda was cited in the Office Action merely for disclosing a polarized filter located substantially in level with the end of a camera housing. Nowhere in Toyoda does it disclose any mechanism for changing the

viewing angle of the camera.

Accordingly, none of the cited references disclose the feature of “*a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor,*” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from the combination of the cited references.

Claims 2-12, 16, 18-22 and 27 depend from claim 1. Therefore, the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are applicable to claims 2-12, 16, 18-22 and 27. Hence, claims 2-12, 16, 18-22 and 27 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of the cited references.

Claim 10, as amended, is patentable for the additional reason that it recites “*a lens cap covering the opening, and an O ring between the lens cap and the end of the shell.*” This feature is advantageous because, among other reasons, the network camera can be made to be weatherproof or weather resistant. See, for example, paragraph [0044] of the specification. Campbell at best discloses creating a tight seal between a windshield and a bracket to prevent using an annular seal 41. See Campbell, col. 4, ll. 8-31. The annular seal 41 prevents fogging in the lens of the camera. See Campbell, col. 2, ll. 37-40. Campbell, however, fails to disclose any sealing mechanism for preventing moisture or contaminants from entering the camera itself. Likewise, Schnell also fails to disclose this feature. Schnell at best discloses sealing the housing of a motion detector camera to be waterproof. See Schnell, col. 2, ll. 54-60. Schnell, however, fails to disclose using an O ring to provide sealing between a lens cap and a housing of the camera. Kendrick, Tashiro, Novak, MacKay, Ward, Strandwitz, McBride and Toyoda fail to disclose any sealing mechanism for cameras. Therefore, claim 10 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for reciting the

feature of *“a lens cap covering the opening, and an O ring between the lens cap and the end of the shell.”*

Independent claim 26, as amended, also recites the feature of *“a positioning knob connected to the adjustable video sensor assembly for manually adjusting a viewing angle of the adjustable video sensor.”* Therefore, the arguments set forth above for claim 1 are applicable to claim 26, as amended.

In addition, independent claim 26, as amended, recites the following:

... the low profile camera housing comprising:

a first mounting point at an upper front portion of the low profile camera housing for attaching to a first mounting assembly, the first mounting assembly adapted for flush mounting the end of the shell in direct contact with the external transparent medium;

a second mounting point at an upper rear portion of the low profile camera housing for attaching to a second mounting assembly; and

a third mounting point at a lower rear portion of the low profile camera housing for attaching to a third mounting assembly . . .

The network video camera mounting system of claim 1 includes a low profile camera housing that includes at least three mounting points. The first mounting point is located at an upper front portion of the low profile camera housing for attaching to a first mounting assembly. The second mounting point is located at an upper rear portion of the low profile camera housing for attaching to a second mounting assembly. The third mounting point is located at a lower rear portion of the lower rear portion of the low profile camera housing.

The feature of “the low profile camera housing comprising a first mounting point . . . a second mounting point . . . and a third mounting point . . .” is advantageous because, among other reasons, the network video camera may be mounted at various locations in various positions using different mounting assemblies.

None of the cited references disclose this feature. Campbell discloses a camera mount bracket 1 attached to a windshield using an adhesive 41. See Campbell, col. 3, ll. 46-47. An optical device 2 is then mounted onto a groove 19 formed on the camera mount bracket 1. See Campbell, col. 4, ll. 27-30. Campbell does not disclose mounting points at other locations of the optical device for attaching to different mounting assemblies. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Campbell.

Kendrick also fails to disclose this feature. Kendrick discloses a pair of suction cups 16, 17 for mounting a housing 15 to a lamp assembly. See Kendrick, col. 5, ll. 5-9. Kendrick, however, does not disclose any other mounting points for attaching to different mounting assemblies. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Kendrick.

Tashiro also fails to disclose this feature. Tashiro at best discloses two hooking holes 2a provided at the back of the base 2 of a camera apparatus 1. See Tashiro, FIG. 2; col. 3, ll. 38-45. The two hooking holes 2a are attached to a camera holder 11. See Tashiro, FIG. 2, Tashiro, however, does not disclose any other mounting points of the camera apparatus for attaching to different mounting assemblies.

Novak also fails to disclose this feature. Novak was cited in the Office Action for teaching a system for controlling a web-cam transmission. Nowhere in Novak does it disclose any mechanism for attaching a camera to any mounting assemblies. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Novak.

Schnell also fails to disclose this feature. Schnell discloses a camera 100 that can be mounted on a first arm 122 and a second arm 124. See Schnell, FIGS. 2A and 2B; and col. 3, ll. 13-25. Schnell also discloses a camera 400 that can be mounted on a tripod 410. See



Schnell, FIGS. 4A and 4B; and col. 5, ll. 20-30. The camera 100 and the camera 400 are separate embodiments, and both cameras can be mounted only to the arms 122, 124 or the tripod 410 but not both. Therefore, Schnell also fails to disclose a camera with multiple mounting points for attachment to different mounting assemblies. Hence, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Schnell.

MacKay also fails to disclose this feature. MacKay was cited in the Office Action merely for disclosing the use of a polarized filter on the front of the camera. Nowhere in MacKay does it disclose multiple mounting points on the camera for attachment to different mounting assemblies. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from MacKay.

Ward also fails to disclose this feature. Ward was cited in the Office Action merely for transmitting a captured image data through a network. Ward does not disclose any mechanism for mounting a camera. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Ward.

Strandwitz also fails to disclose this feature. Strandwitz was cited in the Office Action for disclosing a wireless camera that transmits images through a network. Strandwitz does not disclose any mechanism for mounting a camera. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Strandwitz.

McBride also fails to disclose this feature. McBride was cited in the Office Action for disclosing a surveillance system where the camera communicates via a power line to a monitor or to a network. McBride does not disclose any mechanism for mounting a camera. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from McBride.

Toyoda also fails to disclose this feature. Toyoda discloses a camera with an optical filter for a photographic lens. See Toyoda, col. 1, ll. 6-7. Toyoda was cited in the Office Action merely for disclosing a polarized filter located substantially in level with the end of the camera housing. Nowhere in Toyoda does it disclose any mechanism for mounting a camera. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from Toyoda.

Accordingly, none of the cited references disclose the feature of “the low profile camera housing comprising a first mounting point . . . a second mounting point . . . and a third mounting point . . .” as recited in claim 26, as amended. Therefore, claim 26, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from the combination of the cited references.

Claims 28, 30 and 31 depend from claim 26. Therefore, the same arguments set forth above for claim 26 are applicable to claims 28, 30 and 31. Accordingly, claims 28, 30 and 31 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of the cited references.

Based on the above amendment and the remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1-12, 16, 18-22, 24, 26-28 and 30-31 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12, 16, 18-22, 24, 26-28 and 30-31, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2823.

Respectfully Submitted,  
W. PAUL WILLES, ET AL.

Date: October 21, 2008

By: /Deepti Panchawagh-Jain, #43,846/

Deepti Panchawagh-Jain, Reg. No. 43,846  
THE LAW OFFICE OF DEEPTI PANGHAWAGH-JAIN LLP  
P.O. Box 52050  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Phone: (408) 528-9603